23rd March 1960] [Sri P. T. Rajan]

that they do not show respect to others. Incidentally, I say that in these two 'sannidhanams', the priest does not garland any person, however eminent he may be. All that he does is to give "Vibudhi", "Kumkum" or some flowers but he never garlands anybody. Unfortunately, in our temples garlands are put round the neck of the person. The bigger the man the bigger the garland. (Laughter) I feel that in all temples no garlanding should take place for in the eyes of God all are equal (cheers). Let there be one place at least wherein we can be equals. For various reasons you have got to have distinction in everyday line. There is the Superior Officer, Inferior Officer, Gazetted Officer, N.G.O. and so on. But in the eyes of God all are equals. There must be a place, I mean the temple, in which all should be equals. (Sri K. T. Kosalram : Socialism.) Better confine your socialism to politics I want to make an appeal to the Hon. Minister that this garlanding business should stop, within the temple. Let it be there in other places for in these days, with regard to some people, garlanding seems to be an important thing. Unless a visitor is garlanded, he feels hurt. Let that be continued in places other than temples. That does not matter. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition also took objection to the giving of "purnakumbam". That is given to very important persons. That business also may be stopped. Only in rare cases "purnakumbam" should be given.

I only wanted to make it clear to the public that whatever may be the controversy raised by the Deputy Minister (there may be so many people interested in creating controversies), I would say that in these two temples the practice is that the priest does not make any distinction between this and that man and between the rich and the poor. As I said previously, I want the Hon. Minister to see to it that "garlanding" of persons is given up inside the temples. Thank you, Sir.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House will now adjourn and meet again at 10-30 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned.

VI.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

* 315. *Madras Government's Review on the working of the Fertilizers and Chemicals, Travancore, Limited, Alwaye, Kerala State, for the year ended 31st December 1958. [Laid on the table of the House under section 639 (2) of the Companies Act.]*

* 316. *Notification issued under section 22 of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, regarding the ryotwari settlement of Estates in Chingleput district other than Kachinad Estate issued with Memorandum No. 115375-J3/50-2, Revenue, dated 17th February 1960.*

* 317. *Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 3569, Home, dated 19th December 1958, regarding amendment to rule 337 of the Madras Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940.*

[23rd March 1960

* 318. *Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No.* 3287, *Home, dated* 19*th December* 1959, *regarding amendment to rule* 215 *of the Madras Motor Vehicles Rules*, 1940.

* 319. *Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No.* 166, *Home, dated* 20*th January* 1960, *regarding amendments to the Madras Motor Vehicles Rules*, 1940.

* 320. *Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No.* 165, *Home, dated* 29*th January* 1960, *regarding certain consequential changes in the Madras Motor Vehicles Rules*, 1940.

* 321. *Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No.* 220, *Home, dated* 23*rd January* 1960, *regarding certain consequential changes in the Madras Motor Vehicles Rules*, 1940.

* 322. *Notifications issued with Memorandum No.* 10756–J3/59-2, *Revenue, dated* 27*th January* 1960, *under section* 22 *of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act,* 1948, *relating to the ryotwari settlement of the estates situated in Chingleput district.*

* * 323. *A review of working of the nationalised Transport in Madras State during* 1959–60.

---

* Placed on the table of the House on 18th March 1960.

** Placed on the table of the House on 22nd March 1960.